

ADAMS, J.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

LEE D. WILLIAMS

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. HADDAD

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

CASE NO. 4:06CV1808

Judge John R. Adams

ORDER

(Resolves Docs. 84, 85)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to reconsider the denial of his motion to compel and his motion for the undersigned to recuse. For the reasons that follow, the motions are DENIED.

In his motion to recuse, Plaintiff indicates that he intends on filing a complaint of judicial misconduct against the undersigned. Plaintiff has not filed such a complaint, nor has he indicated any specific facts of any kind that would warrant recusal in this matter. Accordingly, the motion to recuse is DENIED.

In his motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff contends that he complied with Loc.R. 37.1 regarding discovery disputes because under that rule "Plaintiff has to wait more than ten (10) days after the discovery cut-off date to file a Motion to Compel." Plaintiff is incorrect. Loc.R. 37.1(b) reads as follows:

"No discovery dispute shall be brought to the attention of the Court, and no motion to compel may be filed, more than ten (10) days after the discovery cut-off date."

(emphasis added). Thus, the Court finds no error in its determination that Plaintiff's motion to

compel was untimely. The motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

Plaintiff's motion to reconsider (Doc. 85) and motion to recuse (Doc. 84) are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

June 22, 2009
Date

/s/ John R. Adams
Judge John R. Adams
United States District Court